



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**THE DETERMINATION OF AN AFFECTIVE, COGNITIVE AND
CONATIVE MEASURE OF CONSUMER ETHNOCENTRISM**

KENNY TEOH GUAN CHENG.

GSM 2006 9

**THE DETERMINATION OF AN AFFECTIVE,
COGNITIVE AND CONATIVE MEASURE
OF CONSUMER ETHNOCENTRISM**

By

KENNY TEOH GUAN CHENG

**Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School of Management,
Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

November 2006



DEDICATION

“To God Be The Glory!”

To my wife, Cynthia; and daughter, Carol:

Thank you for your forbearance, your sacrifice and your love.

To my Mother and Father:

A debt of gratitude I owe you; a debt I can never repay.

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia
in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

**THE DETERMINATION OF AN AFFECTIVE,
COGNITIVE AND CONATIVE MEASURE
OF CONSUMER ETHNOCENTRISM**

By

KENNY TEOH GUAN CHENG

June 2007

Chair: Professor Samsinar Md. Sidin, PhD

Faculty: Graduate School of Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia

As a measure of consumer ethnocentrism, CETSCALE has aroused great interest in the field of consumer behaviour. However, despite CETSCALE's popularity, there is sufficient theoretical evidence to support investigating its content validity. Various authorities have questioned the purity of the scale, i.e., its lack of domain specificity; In particular, the items that comprise CETSCALE seem to be indicative of other phenomena such as patriotism, protectionism, and even xenophobia! Consequently, this study addresses CETSCALE's lack of domain specificity by proposing a theoretically sound psychometric scale that is 1) true to Sumner's (1906) definition of consumer ethnocentrism, 2) embraces Rosenberg and Hovlands' (1960) 3-Component View of Attitude model, and 3) faithful to Churchill's (1979) Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs.

Volumes one, two and three of Marketing Scales Handbook (American Marketing Association)—comprising 1,647 psychometric scales—were used as the oracle, from which was derived an initial pool of 249 items. Based on a sample of 803

respondents, these items were subjected to factor analysis (exploratory and confirmatory), finally giving rise to the 14-item scale TRUCET scale. TRUCET scale has good psychometric properties, consistently demonstrating construct validity in various tests of discriminance and convergence. Its predictability has also been demonstrated in a nomological framework with related constructs. And it meets the requirements of face validity.

The results indicate TRUCET scale to be domain specific. It presents researchers with an alternative measure of consumer ethnocentrism which is untainted with foreign artefacts.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah
Doktor Falsafah

**PENENTUAN PENGUKUR BERCIRI AFEKTIF, KOGNITIF
DAN KONATIF BAGI KEETNOSENTRIKAN PENGGUNA**

Oleh

KENNY TEOH GUAN CHENG

Jun 2007

Pengerusi: Profesor Samsinar Md. Sidin, PhD

**Fakulti: Sekolah Pengajian Siswazah Pengurusan
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

Sebagai pengukur etnosentrisme pengguna, CETSCALE telah banyak menarik perhatian di bidang gelagat pengguna. Namun, di sebalik kepopularan CETSCALE, terdapat cukup bukti-bukti teori untuk menyiasat kesahihan kandungannya. Beberapa pakar telah mempersoalkan ketulenan skala ini, iaitu, kekurangan ketepatan domainnya. Khasnya, butir-butir dalam CETSCALE seolah-olah membayangkan fenomena lain seperti patriotisma, lindungisma, bahkan juga xenofobia! Natijahnya, kajian ini menangani kekurangan ketepatan domain CETSCALE dengan mencadangkan sebuah skala psikometrik yang berkukuhan teori dan yang juga 1) mematuhi definasi etnosentrisme pengguna yang telah diberikan oleh Sumner (1906), 2) mengandungi model 3-Komponen Pandangan Sikap oleh Rosenberg dan Hovland (1960), dan 3) menepati Paradigma Untuk Mencipta Pengukur Binaan Pemasaran yang dihasilkan oleh Churchill (1979).

Jilid satu, dua dan tiga dari siri Buku Panduan Skala Pemasaran (Persatuan Pemasaran Amerika) yang mengandungi 1,647 skala psikometrik, telah digunapakai

sebagai orakel untuk menghasilkan 249 butir-butir sebagai kumpulan butiran asal. Berlandaskan kepada sampel sebanyak 803 responden, butir-butir asal ini telah dianalisis dengan analisa fakta (exploratori dan konfirmatori) dan akhirnya menghasilkan skala TRUCET yang terdiri dari 14 butiran. Skala TRUCET mempunyai ciri-ciri psikometrik yang baik dan ianya, dengan konsisten telah menunjukkan kesahihan binaan di bawah berbagai ujian diskriminasi dan bertumpuan. Daya ramalan skala TRUCET juga telah ditunjukkan di dalam sebuah kerangka nomologi dengan binaan yang berkaitan. Ianya juga memenuhi syarat kesahihan muka.

Hasil kajian membayangkan bahawa skala TRUCET adalah tepat pada domainnya. Ianya menawarkan para penyelidik satu pengukur alternatif etnosentrisme pengguna yang tidak tercemar dengan artifak asing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To Professor Samsinar Md Sidin, Associate Professor Dr Murali Sambasivan and Dr Rosli Salleh—my supervisory committee—thank you for your mentoring and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis.

Murali: It was my karma to meet you; and your dharma to show me how. Nandri!

To my colleagues and friends at the Faculty of Economics and Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia: It takes a faculty to produce a PhD – Thank you for the advice, the concern, the kinds words and the assistance.

To my colleagues and friends at the Graduate School of Management (GSM), Universiti Putra Malaysia: Thank you!

To Vincent and friends at Pustaka Prinsip: Thank you for all the assistance!

To everyone else, for your prayers and your good wishes: Thank you!

I certify that an Examination Committee met on **3 November 2006** to conduct the final examination of **Kenny Teoh Guan Cheng** on his **Doctor of Philosophy** thesis entitled, **“The Determination Of An Affective, Cognitive And Conative Measure of Consumer Ethnocentrism,”** in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

Rozhan Othman, PhD

Professor
Graduate School of Management
Universiti Putra Malaysia.
(Chairman)

Hazman Shah Vijayan bin Abdullah, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Science Administration and Policy Studies
Universiti Teknologi MARA
(External Examiner)

Abdul Razak bin Kamaruddin, PhD


Associate Professor
Faculty of Management and Economics
University College of Science and Technology
(Internal Examiner)

Nabsiah bte Abdul Wahid, PhD

School of Management
Universiti Sains Malaysia
(Internal Examiner)

Samsinar Md. Sidin, PhD

Professor
Faculty of Economics and Management
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Representative of Supervisory Committee/Observer)



SHAMSHER MOHAMAD RAMADILI, PHD
Professor/Deputy Dean
Graduate School of Management
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 24/10/07

This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

Samsinar Md. Sidin, PhD

Professor

Faculty of Economics and Management

Universiti Putra Malaysia

(Chairman)

Murali Sambasivan, PhD

Associate Professor

Faculty of Economics and Management

Universiti Putra Malaysia


(Member)

Rosli Salleh, PhD

Faculty of Economics and Management

Universiti Putra Malaysia

(Member)



SAMSINAR MD. SIDIN, PHD

Profesor/Dean

Graduate School of Management

Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 15/11/07

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or at any other institution.



KENNY TEOH GUAN CHENG

Date: 21 August 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vii
APPROVAL	viii
DECLARATION	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Motivation for the research	2
1.2 Problem statement	4
1.3 Objectives of the research	7
1.4 Scope of the research	8
1.5 Contribution of the research	9
1.6 Organization of this dissertation	10

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW	13
2.1 Consumer ethnocentrism	13
2.2 Shimp and Sharma's definition of consumer ethnocentrism	17
2.3 Consumer ethnocentrism and social desirability bias	17
2.4 Consumer ethnocentrism and Country-Of-Origin	20
2.5 Consumer ethnocentrism and marketing strategy	24
2.6 Consumer ethnocentrism and services	26
2.7 Consumer ethnocentrism and personality traits	28
2.8 Consumer ethnocentrism – its application in relation to other constructs; and its variant forms	28
2.9 The effects of demography on consumer ethnocentrism	31
2.10 Antecedents and moderators of consumer ethnocentrism	34
2.11 The CETSCALE – a scale to measure consumer ethnocentrism	36
2.12 The CETSCALE – reliability and validity	39
2.13 Stability of the CETSCALE	42
2.14 Ethnocentrism. The original concept as expounded by Sumner and by others	45
2.15 Conclusion	46



Chapter 3

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS, CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT	47
3.1 Theoretical foundation	47
3.2 CETSCALE – content (face) validity	52
3.3 CETSCALE – CONATIVE bias	55
3.4 A new definition of consumer ethnocentrism	59
3.5 Conceptual framework by Sharma <i>et al.</i>	61
3.6 Hypotheses development	63
3.6.1 <i>Psycho-social factors</i>	63
3.6.2 <i>Moderating factors</i>	68
3.7 Conclusion	69

Chapter 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	70
4.1 Research strategy	70
4.2 Research design	71
4.3 Development of the TRUCET scale	74
4.4 Initial item pool for TRUCET scale	85
4.5 The data collection instrument–the questionnaire	94
4.6 Pre-test of the instrument	95
4.7 Reliability and validity of the measurement instrument	96
4.7.1 <i>Reliability</i>	96
4.7.2 <i>Validity</i>	97
4.8 Sampling	99
4.8.1 <i>Sampling frame</i>	99
4.8.2 <i>Sampling unit</i>	100
4.8.3 <i>Sample size</i>	100
4.8.4 <i>Sampling technique</i>	101
4.8.5 <i>Sampling representativeness</i>	102
4.9 Statistical analysis techniques	102
4.9.1 <i>Data screening and descriptive statistics</i>	102
4.9.2 <i>Corrrelation</i>	103
4.9.3 <i>Structural equation modelling</i>	103
4.9.4 <i>Factor analysis (Exploratory and confirmatory)</i>	103
4.9.5 <i>Path analysis</i>	105
4.10 Overview of statistical techniques employed	105
4.11 Overview of the research methodology employed	106
4.12 Conclusion	108

Chapter 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	109
5.1 Derivation of TRUCET scale and test for reliability; and correlation with related constructs	109
5.1.1 <i>Descriptive statistics</i>	110
5.1.2 <i>Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)</i>	117
5.1.3 <i>Confirmatory factor analysis</i>	120
5.1.4 <i>Reliability</i>	125
5.1.5 <i>Demographic variables</i>	127
5.2.1 <i>Data screening</i>	131
5.2.2 <i>Descriptive statistics</i>	132
5.2.3 <i>Convergent and discriminant validity</i>	139
5.2.4 <i>Nomological validity</i>	141
5.3 Summary of statistical analyses and tests of hypotheses	147
5.4 Conclusion	153

Chapter 6

CONCLUSION	154
6.1. Summary of findings	154
6.2. Theoretical implications	155
6.3. Policy implications	156
6.4. Marketing implications	157
6.5. Limitations of the research	158
6.6. Directions for future research	159
6.7. Conclusion	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY	162
LIST OF APPENDICES	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Analysis of CETSCALE items. Examining item–construct identity.	53
Table 2: The affection, cognition and conation dimensions of CETSCALE.	57
Table 3: Scales selected to form the basis for deriving TRUCET scale.	76
Table 4: Initial item pool for new measure of consumer ethnocentrism – TRUCET scale.	85
Table 5: List of analyses; and the statistical techniques used respectively.	105
Table 6: Respondents' age.	110
Table 7: Respondents' race.	111
Table 8: Respondents' sex.	112
Table 9: Respondents' education.	112
Table 10: Respondents' employment.	113
Table 11: Respondents' income.	113
Table 12: Respondents' travel.	114
Table 13: Respondents' marital status.	115
Table 14: Respondents' level of management.	115
Table 15: Respondents' origin.	116
Table 16: Respondents' current state of residence.	116
Table 17: Exploratory Factor Analysis – First iteration.	117
Table 18: Initial 30 items for TRUCET scale after Exploratory Factor Analysis (1st round).	119
Table 19: Potential items for TRUCET scale after Exploratory Factor Analysis (10 th iteration).	121
Table 20: Analysis of items with potential for conceptual purification – TRUCET scale.	123
Table 21: The TRUCET scale.	124
Table 22: Fit indices–TRUCET scale.	125
Table 23: Reliability – TRUCET scale.	125
Table 24: Reliability–Openness scale.	126
Table 25: Reliability–Patriotism-Conservatism scale.	126
Table 26: Reliability–Collectivism-Individualism scale.	126
Table 27: Reliability–Dogmatism scale.	126
Table 28: ANOVA. Age by consumer ethnocentrism scale (TRUCET scale).	128
Table 29: T-Test. Sex by consumer ethnocentrism scale (TRUCET scale).	128
Table 30: Correlation. Education by consumer ethnocentrism scale (TRUCET scale).	129
Table 31: ANOVA. Income by consumer ethnocentrism scale (TRUCET scale).	130
Table 32: Respondents' age (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset)	132
Table 33: Respondents' race (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset).	133

Table 34: Respondents’ sex (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 133

Table 35: Respondents’ years of education (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 134

Table 36: Respondents’ employment (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset) 135

Table 37: Respondents’ monthly income (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 135

Table 38: Respondents’ travel (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 136

Table 39: Respondents’ marital status (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 136

Table 40: Respondents’ level of management. (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 137

Table 41: Respondents’ rural-urban origin. (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 138

Table 42: Respondents’ current state of residence. (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 138

Table 43: Correlation Matrix – Convergence and discriminance (“TRUCET v CETSCALE” dataset). 141



LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Model of the influences on purchase-related behaviour in support of American workers. (Granzin and Olsen, 1998)	30
Figure 2: “Three component view of attitude,” Rosenberg et al., (1960)	55
Figure 3: Antecedents and moderators of the CETSCALE and its role as the causal determinant of attitudes toward importing foreign products (Sharma et al., 1995)	61
Figure 4: TRUCET scale, its related constructs, moderating factors and its role as the causal determinant of attitudes toward importing foreign products	63
Figure 5: Churchill’s paradigm for creation of an instrument to measure a construct	71
Figure 6: Adaptation of Churchill’s paradigm for the creation of TRUCET scale	107

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The word “ethnocentrism” is coined by Sumner (1906). In his book, “Folkways,” Sumner has used the word to refer to ethnic-centric feelings (hence, ethnocentrism), and, on this premise, Sumner goes on to define the concept to denote the feeling of superiority that are felt by people of the same grouping (in-groups) vis-à-vis non-members (out-groups). Shimp, in his seminal work (1984) has adapted Sumner’s 1906 concept of ethnocentrism to the study of consumer behaviour and named it “consumer ethnocentrism”. Shimp defines consumer ethnocentrism as the inclination of citizens of a country to prefer their own products and to reject those that are made by foreigners, even taking punitive action against them. Subsequently, there has been published, various literature on the concept of consumer ethnocentrism (Shimp and Sharma, 1987; Levin *et al.*, 1993; Sharma, Shimp and Shin, 1995; Ruyter *et al.*, 1998; Movado and Tan, 1999; Batra *et al.*, 2000; and Speece and Pinkeo, 2002). Currently, consumer ethnocentrism is measured by the measurement scale which is named CETSCALE (Shimp and Sharma, 1987). The literature is replete with research on consumer ethnocentrism and its implications for marketing. In particular, consumer ethnocentrism is seen as a novel way to assess how the citizens of a country feel that their products are superior to foreign products; and their consequent rejection of foreign products. From this assessment, marketers may adopt measures to exploit low levels of consumer ethnocentric tendencies; or to mitigate higher ones.

A critique. However, Shimp and Sharma's (1987) definition of consumer ethnocentrism is open to wide interpretation, such that it is possible to impute other constructs to it. These other constructs, such as protectionism (Markusen *et. al*, 1995; Carbaugh, 2004), xenophobia (Booth, 1979), and patriotism (Booth, 1979), although belonging to the same genre, should rightly be treated as separate and distinct constructs from consumer ethnocentrism. However, this is not the case with CETSCALE – a casual examination of CETSCALE will reveal the presence of items that allude strongly to protectionism, xenophobia and patriotism, thus raising the issue of construct purity i.e., domain specificity. There is yet another weakness in the operationalisation of the consumer ethnocentrism concept. That is, the scale items are ponderously conative (an action orientation); whereas theory suggests that there are also two other dimensions involved, namely, cognition (knowledge and perception) and affection (emotions) (Rosenberg and Hovland's, 1960. "3 Component View of Attitude." These latter two dimensions are lacking in CETSCALE.

1.1 Motivation for the research

There have been many calls for better quality instruments and their *raison d'être* has always been: "Perhaps the older measures are inadequate. The researcher should make sure that this is the case by conducting a thorough review of literature in which the variable is used and should present a detailed statement of reasons and evidence as to why the measurement is better," (Churchill's 1977, pp. 67). Hence, we forward two reasons that motivate this research: (1) Shimp and Sharma's (1987) definition is not sufficiently domain specific, and (2) their measurement scale, CETSCALE, is not sufficiently theoretically rigorous.

Since the introduction of the consumer ethnocentrism concept by Shimp and Sharma (1987), there have been many studies that have either focused on consumer ethnocentrism *per se*; or, consumer ethnocentrism as a subset of a multi-dimensional construct, functioning in the role of antecedent or moderator (Reiersen, 1966, 1967; Nagashima, 1970, 1977; Morello, 1984; Roth and Romeo, 1992; Tse *et al.*, 1996; Sinkovics and Holzmuller, 1994; Herche, 1994; Keillor, Hult, Erffmeyer and Babakus, 1996; Wetzels *et al.*, 1996). However, not one of them has attempted to critically examine Shimp and Sharma's (1987) definition of consumer ethnocentrism. Jacoby (1978) says: "...once proposed, our measures take on an almost sacred and inviolate existence all their own. They are rarely, if ever, examined or questioned," (1978, pp. 91), and he goes on to add that, "In point of fact, most of our measures are only measures because someone says that they are, not because they have been shown to satisfy standard measurement criteria (validity, reliability and sensitivity)," (Jacoby, 1978). This echoes Churchill's (1977) call to examine, re-examine and challenge accepted paradigms because, "[p]erhaps the older measures are inadequate," (pp. 67).

Then, there is that strong warning by Shelby Hunt (1993) who has implied that the CETSCALE needs a re-think because: "Unfortunately, marketing's 'consumer ethnocentrism' has been defined and measured as the belief that 'purchasing imported products is wrong because . . . it hurts the domestic economy, causes loss of jobs, and is plainly unpatriotic . . .'" (Shimp 1984 p. 288; Shimp and Sharma 1987, pp. 280). Though ethnocentric consumers would support 'buy American', those who 'buy American' because of such factors as the fear of 'loss of jobs' are not exhibiting

ethnocentrism, for 'loss of jobs' would be superfluous to ethnocentric consumers. (Such consumers would believe that domestic products are obviously superior to foreign-made ones.) Therefore, the CETSCALE seems closer to measuring a belief in 'protectionism' than genuine 'ethnocentrism.' More generally, whenever marketing borrows concepts that have pejorative connotations, we have a special responsibility to exercise caution," (pp. 86).

Consequently, this thesis addresses the weaknesses that are inherent in the current definition of consumer ethnocentrism; and, by extension, its measure, CETSCALE. Specifically, the definition of consumer ethnocentrism will be examined for construct purity (domain specificity); and, following from that, its measurement scale will be examined for theoretical rigour.

1.2 Problem statement

Since its introduction, the CETSCALE has been demonstrated to be robust, i.e., its reliability and validity have been demonstrated cross-nationally (Shimp and Sharma, 1987; Netemeyer *et al.*, 1991; Good, and Huddleston, 1995). Certainly, the fact that the CETSCALE is reliable and valid suggests that it must measure some construct; but it is the contention of this study that that construct is not necessarily consumer ethnocentrism *per se* because Shimp and Sharma's 1987 definition does not seem to satisfy the requirements of content validity.

Churchill's 1979, "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs," specifies that "[i]f the sample is appropriate and the items 'look right,' the measure is said to have *face* or *content* validity," (pp. 69). This is echoed by

Jacoby (1978): "Face validity...refers to whether a measure looks like it is measuring what it is supposed to be measuring," (pp. 91). The items in the CETSCALE do not 'look right' (Churchill, 1979, pp. 69), because they are more representative of patriotism (The love of one's own country and the willingness to sacrifice for it: Booth, 1979), nationalism (The territorial, ethnic and cultural sentiments that bind people together: Booth, 1979; Levine and Campbell, 1972), protectionism (The protection of local industry through the use of constraints on foreign competition: Markusen *et. al*, 1995; Carbaugh, 2004) and xenophobia (The dislike of foreigners: Booth, 1979). For example, "It is always best to purchase American products" [Patriotism]; "American products, first, last and foremost" [Nationalism]; "Curbs should be put on all imports," [Protectionism] and, "Foreigners should not be allowed to put their products on our markets," [Xenophobia] respectively. Are four items in the CETSCALE which smack of out-group directed belligerence! Hunt (1993) also said: "Therefore, the CETSCALE seems closer to measuring a belief in 'protectionism' than genuine 'ethnocentrism'" (pp. 86). And, more recently, Hunt's opinion has been echoed by Lundstrom, Lee and White (1998, pp. 15): "The ethno-national identity construct, introduced by Sharma *et al.* (1995), measures the ethnocentric protectionist tendencies of the consumers." As to what scale items would 'look right,' that could satisfy the demands of content validity, would have to follow from a discussion of ethnocentrism as defined by Sumner (1906); and the literature on the ethnocentrism concept (See Chapter 2).

An alternative measure of consumer ethnocentrism has recently been proposed by Speece and Pinkaeo (2002). This measure takes a completely different approach from that of Shimp and Sharma (1987). Speece and Pinkaeo (2002) posit that a consumers'

perceived quality (as opposed to *objective* quality) might shift the position of a country from its objective position in the hedonic price/quality relationship – they attribute this shift, which results from *perceived* quality, to the influence of consumer ethnocentrism. A critique of Speece *et al.* is that theirs is a roundabout way of measuring consumer ethnocentrism; whereas Shimp *et al.*'s method is more direct in nature. Nevertheless, Speece *et al.*, do not address the issue of the out-group directed belligerence that is inherent in the CETSCALE.

The cause of belligerence in the CETSCALE may be attributed to aetiology. CETSCALE's scale items are largely derived from Shimp's 1984 seminal work where respondents were asked the following open ended question: "*Please describe your views of whether it is right and appropriate for American consumers to purchase products that are manufactured in foreign countries.*" It is not difficult to see how the moralistic innuendo of this question has led to social desirability bias, thus invoking the ire of the respondents who have, consequently, given voice to biased anti-foreign responses! It is from this same set of biased responses that Shimp and Sharma (1987) have derived CETSCALE. Conceivably, quite different responses might have been elicited had the open ended question been worded viz., "What do you think of foreign products?" As a consequence of Shimp's 1984 seminal work, the concept of consumer ethnocentrism, as it is understood in the extant literature, and, first postulated by him in, "Consumer Ethnocentrism: The Concept and a Preliminary Empirical Investigation," (1984), has been defined as "...the notion that some consumers believe that it is somehow wrong to purchase foreign-made products, because it will hurt the domestic economy, cause the loss of jobs, and, in short, because, from their point of view, it is plainly unpatriotic." (pp 285). Three years

later, and *based on this same definition*, Shimp and Sharma published, "Consumer Ethnocentrism: Construction and Validation of the CETSCALE, 1987" in which they propose their concept of consumer ethnocentrism; and its measurement scale, CETSCALE. But, from Shimp's 1984 work, it is evident that Shimp and Sharma's (1987) definition is *not domain specific* – that is, it contains elements of economic protectionism, patriotism and xenophobia. Hence, Jacoby's (1978) plea that new scales should be domain specific has not been met.

Compounding the CETSCALE's lack of domain specificity is its conative bias. Rosenberg and Hovland's (1960) "3 Component View of Attitude" theorises that an attitude (consumer ethnocentrism) may be decomposed into 3 components, namely *affection, cognition* and *conation*. Chapter 3 demonstrates that the items that make up CETSCALE are overly conative and not sufficiently, cognitive and affective. This renders the scale lopsided in that there is over-representation of one component only, that is, conation; but insufficient representation of the other two components, namely, cognition and affection.

The research question. Therefore we frame the research question thus: "Can Shimp and Sharma's (1987) definition and measurement scale of consumer ethnocentrism be theoretically and operationally improved?"

1.3 Objectives of the research

An extensive examination of the literature on ethnocentrism, consumer ethnocentrism and CETSCALE reveals that there are substantial issues to be addressed. These issues stem from weaknesses in the definition of the consumer

ethnocentrism construct and the consequent effects of these weaknesses on the measurement scale, CETSCALE. Hence, this thesis proposes a new scale as an alternative measure of consumer ethnocentrism – one that consolidates the recommendations of Hunt (1993) and Lee and White (1998) on construct specificity; and Rosenberg and Hovland (1960) on the components of attitude.

General objective. Therefore, the general objective of this study is the development of a new measure of consumer ethnocentrism.

Specific objectives. And, the development of this new measure of consumer ethnocentrism will be predicated on the following 3 specific objectives:

1. The proposed new definition of consumer ethnocentrism should inherit the spirit and the intent of Sumner in his 1906 definition of ethnocentrism;
2. The new measurement scale of consumer ethnocentrism should be free of contamination by other constructs, and
3. The new measurement scale should consist of items that adequately satisfy the theoretical rigor of Rosenberg and Hovland's (1960) 3-Component View of Attitude model.

1.4 Scope of the research

For reasons of finance, logistics and manageability, this research is necessarily limited in terms of geography and longitude. This research is exploratory and its test bed is confined to Malaysia. Data was collected from all the states that form the federation of Malaysia, inclusive of its federal territories. Endeavours to determine cross-national (geographical) robustness will be left to subsequent research.